Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0477OR-2 for McMinnville School District #40

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does an excellent job of outlining a comprehensive and detailed reform vision that builds upon existing initiatives in the State of Oregon. In 2011, the Governor and State Legislature passed Senate Bill 253 that ushered in new change and direction for ensuring a highly educated state that was career ready and able to earn a living family wage. The strategies to ensure goal attainment included the implementation of a holistic and seamless education system from birth through postsecondary education, which is clearly aligned with three of the four core educational assurance areas in the Race-to-The Top District program. As a result, the applicant has designed a system that includes adoption of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and investing significant resources in professional development for teachers and administrators. One of the key resources in professional development is Rigorous Curriculum Design (RCD), a sequenced hands-on model of curriculum design and a framework that systematically connects CCSS based curriculum.

Clearly, the applicant is focused on deepening student learning and increasing buy-in by school stakeholders (i.e., teachers, administrators) as evidenced by the detailed description of how they will measure student growth, which includes establishing Achievement Compacts with all the districts, and creating a new system of accountability to evaluate the performance of schools based on weighted objectives. A performance-based compensation system for teachers and administrators was implemented in 2011-2012 school year and includes performance in four key categories (e.g., school-wide achievement on statewide assessments in reading and math by student subgroup, classroom based value-added growth on common formative and summative assessments, additional leadership duties). While the applicant does not have any schools that qualify as low-performing, the overall approach to investing in long-term strategies that will result in a college and career ready student population is clearly described.

The applicant provides a detailed list of goals and objectives that are ambitious, yet achievable.

Overall, the applicant has done an excellent job of articulating the vision and demonstrating a detailed plan for implementation of the proposed project. The overall rating for this area is very high.

	Available	Score
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant provides a detailed chart of the demographics of the school district indicating that an average of 61% of students are from low-income families, and an average of 67% of students are considered high-need. The applicant provides an adequate approach to implementation as the decision to include all schools was made by the Race to the Top Committee that is comprised of teachers, administrators, and the President of the McMinnville Education Association. The applicant presents clear evidence of buy-in to the process by school site educators as teachers and administrators have been included in the implementation process.

Weakness:

While the applicant provides information on the schools that are included in the process, no details are provided on how the schools were chosen. Moreover, the Race to the Top Committee does not appear to have community partners, parents, and/or students as members of the committee. As parent, students, and community partners are a critical piece to ensuring the success of the project, details on their role and buy-in are critical to ensuring success with the numerous goals and objectives outlined in the overall vision for reform.

The overall rating for this area is ranked in the low area of high.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	8

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant does a good job of articulating a high-quality plan that includes goals, objectives, timelines, deliverables, and key personnel associated with improving school culture and climate. The goals include increasing student engagement, fostering healthy social and emotional development by implementing Positive Behavior and Instruction Supports district-wide, and through the implementation of a performance-based evaluation system for teachers and administrators that includes a performance-based compensation system that is tied to student achievement and growth. The proposed system design is aligned with the State legislative senate bill that focuses on creating a college and career ready student population, which will help the applicant reach the goal of increasing student achievement and engagement.

The applicant has indicated that all schools are included in the project and therefore scale-up will automatically take place.

Weaknesses:

The applicant fails to provide a logic model or theory of change, which would help in determining if the strategies employed are on the right course to achieving the stated outcomes identified in the implementation plan.

The overall rating for this section is a high medium.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	10

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant does a great job of outlining goals and objectives by sub-groups. The proposed goals are ambitious, yet obtainable as evidenced by the detailed description of activities outlined in the narrative that will be implemented to decrease achievement gaps and increase graduation and college enrollment rates. The implementation of reform initiatives such as field-based and flipped learning, blended coursework (i.e. on-line/onsite), credit by proficiency coursework, extended learning opportunities, targeted instruction, double-block/double-dose algebra for all 9th graders, and supplemental reading instruction are just a few of the strategies that will be implemented.

The applicant will implement Smaller Learning Communities, Career Pathways, and community and industry based internships/enterprises which will provide multiple opportunities for teachers to engage students outside of the traditional stand and deliver model. With a performance-based compensation system for teachers and administrators, innovative strategies are needed to ensure that the applicant reaches targeted objectives. Additionally, the applicant provides data and information on postsecondary degree attainment in the 40-40-20 vision goals, which is another example of their exceptional approach.

This applicant scores strongly in this section.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	12

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant does a great job of documenting past successes from 2007-2011 for students in the 11th grade in the area of reading for the target district. All students increased their proficiency levels 15.4%, and students in the various subgroups (e.g., economically disadvantaged, Limited English Proficient, disabled) increased proficiency a minimum of 7.3% to a maximum of 37.1%. Equally, the achievement gap in math was closed for all students except those with disabilities. Yet, the

overall increase in student achievement clearly documents the applicant's ability to implement programming focused on increasing reading and math proficiency.

Another area of strength is the immediate availability of assessment data to teachers and administrators in targeting instruction, customizing interventions, providing enrichment activities, and as a way to keep parents informed of student performance and their status as it relates to graduation.This is extremely important for students who are performing below proficiency in order to ensure appropriate targeted intervention activities. The applicant indicates that they do not have any low performing schools and are unable to address this selction criterion.

Weakness:

The applicant does not document significant reform in improving graduation or college enrollment rates as the data provided on graduation and college enrollment rates shows a decline and/or up and down percentages from year-to-year with no explanation for the inconsistency or decline. This is critical as the applicant indicates that they have dual credit programs that allow students to earn college credit while still enrolled in high school.

It is not clear how student performance data will be accessible to parents outside of the district database as the applicant does not address this area. With a large low-income population (over 60%), having other options for accessing data is important to ensuring that the needs of parents and students are being considered.

Overall, this section is ranked on the low end of the high section.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	4

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant provides sufficient information on their process for sharing budget information that includes the creation of a comprehensive annual financial report that is placed on the district website in an Open Education Source. Additionally, the applicant indicates that the superintendent and district fiscal services officer provides detailed budget presentations to the general public at town hall meetings, local services clubs, and during Parent Teacher Association Executive Council meetings.

The types of data provided on the website includes actual school-level personnel salaries for instructional, administrative, and support staff as well as school level expenditures. Additionally, the applicant has been recognized by the Government Finance Officers Association for high standards in government and financial reporting further demonstrating their ability to be highly transparent.

Weakness:

While the applicant provides information on the types of data that will be shared on the website and at PTA Council meetings, there does not appear to be other mechanisms for ensuring transparency for parents and/or low-income families who may not participate in town hall meetings or have access to technology resources.

Overall, this section is rated a low high.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant clearly describes their ability to successfully and sufficiently implement the proposed project with autonomy and with the support of the State. The state of Oregon passed legislation in 2011 that is aligned with the Race to the Top District four core educational reform areas and that establishes incentives and supports for districts who pilot performance -based compensation and evaluation models (one of the four core areas) for principals and teachers. Additionally, the state has provided an ESEA waiver that resulted in expanded flexibility and autonomy for districts to implement holistic education reform including the adoption of the Common Core State Standards.

The applicant presents strong information on how the ESEA waiver will allow the proposed project flexibility in raising standards, creating fair and flexible accountability systems, and strategies for improving evaluation and support systems for teachers and principals. For example, the legislation will allow for Smarter Balanced assessments, and the ability to raise rigor on all standards.

Overall, this section scores very high and strong.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	7

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant does a good job of describing the community-wide approach to align the proposed project with the goals and objectives of the Race to the Top four core educational assurance areas and with the 2011 state legislation that established incentives and supports for districts that instituted meaningful change in their current educational system. Some of the strategies and approaches used include creating a Race to the Top Committee comprised of teachers, administrators, associated student body leadership, parent teacher associations, early childhood council, and local postsecondary institutions. The applicant presents letters of support indicating that the PTA and local political leaders fully support the project. The applicant demonstrates significant support from the collective bargaining union as evidenced by the letter of support provided, and participation by the union president in the overall program design.

Weakness:

While the applicant provides a list of different organizations that were part of the Race to the Top Committee, there are no details on their input. For example, the applicant identifies members of the Effective Educators Design team that appears to only have teachers and administrators as part of the committee with no community stakeholders and/or parents involved in the committee. As the applicant is creating a total redesign of their approach to educating students, it is critical that parent input, more specifically their Hispanic Parent Advisory Committee (as the applicant has indicated this is their largest subgroup they will need to support) be integrated in the redesign of the education system. There are no details on how or if the proposal was revised based on feedback and direct engagement with committee members.

Overall this section has a score of medium.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	1

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant provides a brief overview of the strategic planning process implemented in 2008 to develop an evidenced-based road map (titled Vision 2020) that would guide school reform efforts. As a result of this process the applicant indicates that an assessment of gaps and needs in the current educational system was conducted and is what has led to comprehensive reform structures and strategies.

Weaknesses:

The applicant fails to adequately address this sub-criterion as there are no details or indication of a high-quality plan for an analysis of the applicant's current status in implementing personalized leaning environments. The information provided is brief and lacks specificity and does not address needs and gaps or the logic behind the proposal. Without a Logic Model or Theory of Change it is difficult to determine how the applicant will implement some of the strategies (i.e., performance-based evaluation system, increasing kindergarten readiness) identified throughout the narrative.

Overall, this section ranks as very low.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	17

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant does a good job of describing some of the strategies that will be implemented in order to be successful in the implementation of several initiatives that are focused on preparing students as early as 0-5. This is a great strategy as there is a national push for early childhood education and the applicant cites research indicating that gaps in both cognitive and non-cognitive abilities emerge early in the life of the child and widen slightly in the early years of schooling. As a result, the applicant will implement a number of programs (i.e., Ready for Kindergarten, Universal half-day preK, Positive Behavior and Instructional Supports) that not only provide early care and education for the young child, but workshops for parents in both English and Spanish that will ensure that students are ready for

kindergarten and beyond. There is a strong STEM component that includes technology resources.

Additionally, the applicant provides a sufficient description of the approach to learning that will empower students, parents, and teachers that include student-created statements of personalized learning goals, multiple methods of representing content and concepts through technology, common formative, interim, and summative assessments, and flipped and blended learning. The applicant understands that students learn in different ways and therefore will implement a number of strategies for ensuring accommodations for high-need students that include the use of technology-rich teaching and learning experiences that can be adapted to meet the needs of learners on various level (i.e., Socratic seminars, multicultural curriculum). There are significant resources outlined in the plan of implementation for training and supporting students as they learn to use technology resources and multi-cultural curriculum.

Moreover, teachers will provides students with a three-step process to developing and monitoring their personalized learning goals through daily lessons and units of study. The applicant does a good job of addressing the majority of the areas in this selection criteria as evidenced by activities associated with providing students with deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest (i.e., STEM, blended learning). Moreover, the applicant addresses the majority of components (i.e., goals, timelines, key personnel) associated with a high-quality plan.

Weaknesses:

The applicant fails to adequately address how they will provide ongoing and regular feedback for individual students. While the applicant provides a number of deliverables in the project implementation plan, the details on updating students as they progress towards college and career-ready standards is not adequately addressed. The applicant has identified a number of strategies for implementation that include online and flipped learning (learning that is done at home), which would require more frequent updates on progress to ensure students are on track to meeting stated objectives.

Overall this section rates a medium high.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	16

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant provides a detailed description of how they will ensure teachers in the target schools receive professional development that will provide strategies to improving instruction and at the same time increase their capacity to support students in increasing rigor. The professional development plan will allow for educators to focus on strategies that will ultimately result in students master college and career-ready standards. The applicant presents many of the elements of a high-quality plan that includes goals, objectives, activities, timelines, deliverables, and key personnel as it relates to increasing educator effectiveness. Teachers will receive professional development in three foundational frameworks (e.g., Rigorous Curriculum Design, Power Strategies for Effective Teaching, and Common Formative Assessments) that will connect learning to the Common Core Standards. Through an embedded staff development approach that will take advantage of professional learning communities, the applicant will move towards meeting the goals of increasing their highly effective teaching staff by a minimum of 3% per year as identified in the implementation plan.

Weaknesses:

The applicant fails to adequately address how they will increase the number of teachers in the STEM related courses. The applicant has indicated that STEM will be a major emphasis for the proposed project, however, there are no details on how they will ensure a well-staffed teaching corps for this field. Moreover, there does not appear to be any discussion around professional development for teachers in the area of special education, which is a population that has significant gaps in learning as evidenced by the low proficiency rates outlined in the narrative.

Overall this section scores on the low end in the high section.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant provides a brief overview of central office staff highlighting the various reporting requirements that scale up to the Superintendent and Board of Directors level. The applicant presents some aspects of a high-quality plan that include providing each school with a leadership team that includes administrators, teachers, and site council members. The role of these leadership teams is to create flexible school schedules and calendars, design staffing models and participate in personnel decisions, and make decisions about the building level budgets. These activities are aligned with a high-quality plan and include responsible key personnel, timelines and deliverables. Overall, the applicant does a good job of identifying the strategies that will be implemented that will focus on opportunities for students to master the common core standards using non-traditional methods like credit by proficiency through online and onsite coursework and through credit recovery modules. Through performance-based assessments that will be implemented multiple times throughout the year, students will have opportunities to demonstrate mastery. Moreover, students with disabilities will have access to the Universal Design for Learning format that provides alternate ways of expression.

Weakness

The applicant fails to adequately address this sub-criterion as there are no details on the consortium governance structure. While the applicant provides an organizational chart highlighting reporting requirements, there are no details on what resources they are responsible for as it relates to overall project objectives. More details on how the site councils report to the various structures outlined in the organization chart. would strengthen this area. Moreover, it is not clear of the overall policies as this information is not clearly defined.

Overall this section scores in the top of the medium section.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant provides a brief response indicating that the proposed project will be implemented district-wide and will provide services from birth -18 years of age. The overall plan to provide technical support through the Family Resource Centers will be implemented at each school, over the phone and online as needed for parents, students and educators. The applicant does provide strong opportunities for scaling up the project and speaks to a high-quality plan as it relates to goals, objectives, key personnel, and timelines.

Weaknesses:

The applicant fails to adequately address this selection criterion as there are no details on how the proposed project will have strong support form the school district. The information provided on supporting personalized learning through technical support and sharing of data in an open format is brief and lacks specificity. The applicant indicates that data will be in a machine-readable format without outlining how data will be shared. It is not clear how parents will be supported as this information is not described. Moreover, how students will have access to resources outside of school is not clearly described. More details on the how are needed to ensure that the project will meet stated objectives.

This section has an overall score of a medium.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	13

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant provides for a formative and summative evaluation model that includes the collection of qualitative and quantitative data. Through the use of an internal evaluator who will assess the effectiveness and cost-benefit of project strategies, evaluate the implementation of individual components, and provide guidance about effective products and practices for dissemination, the applicant will implement the detailed evaluation plan that outlines goals, indicators, and timelines. The evaluation plan is linked to the specific strategic initiatives and includes interim and summative reports that are tied to a process, impact, and outcome evaluation model. The evaluation plan incudes a continuous cycle of monitoring that will continue after

grant funding ends, which is another strength of the project design.

To ensure timely feedback of challenges, the applicant will share information on evaluation outcomes to project leadership and staff during monthly staff and advisory council meetings. There is a good strategy for ensuring that all stakeholders have access to performance data.

Weakness:

It is not clear that the project will include an external evaluator. The magnitude of the project components would benefit greatly from an external evaluator who would bring an alternate lens to the project.

This section scores high.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant does an excellent job of describing their process for ensuring ongoing engagement, communication and dissemination of information that includes sharing through social media, program websites, articles in the local newspaper, and through staff and community meetings. The overall communication design includes the use of a Town Hall meeting approach and the use of students in creating a video about the project outcomes. The various methods of communicating and engaging are well thought out and includes the use of a variety of stakeholders, which will gain buy-in to the overall project objectives.

This section scores very high.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	5

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant provides sufficient information on the performance measures for the percentage of students who will enroll in postsecondary education within 16 months of graduation that are ambitious, yet attainable. The baseline data presented indicates that 58% of students are currently enrolling with a goal of 75% by the end of the grant period. There are a number of initiatives planned that include blended learning opportunities, family support in the area of preparing students for postsecondary education that make the proposed objectives achievable. The applicant has identified 15 performance measures that include 8th grade discipline referral rate, 9th grade on-track attendance, postsecondary degree completion rate, and graduation rates. The detailed list of performance measures that include purpose and rationale are linked to the overall implementation plan and includes methods for evaluating and reviewing the measures to ensure improvement over time. This is another strong aspect of the narrative.

The overall plan for ensuring effective and highly effective teachers is well-developed as evidenced by performance measures that indicate 49.1% highly effective principal and teacher and 50.1% effective principal and teacher at the end of the grant and post grant.

Overall this section is scored high.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant provides a detailed description of the resources leveraged to implement many of the strategies and initiatives that include district general, partnership, and Title I funds. The proposed project has an extensive list of partners as evidenced by the letters of support and the list provided by the applicant. The cost per student is clearly defined with a strong argument for investing in early childhood education as the applicant cites data indicating that an average of $1 invested in early childhood education returns $17, further demonstrating the strength of the project design.

The applicant does a good job of identifying strategies for evaluating effectiveness as evidenced by the key role technology will play in reducing costs (i.e.., flipped learning, credit by proficiency, and blended coursework). Additionally, the applicant has identified strategies to ensure long-term sustainability of professional development that include developing a large cohort of teachers and administrators with training certifications that will ensure site-based capacity to provide high-quality professional development after federal funding ends.

Overall this section is rated very high.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant does an excellent job of outlining the detailed budget narrative that outlines all funding sources and costs for each year of the project. The proposed project budget is reasonable and includes a variety of funding from the district, community stakeholders, private funding, bonds, and local business. The detailed description of why funds are being expended (i.e., professional development, instruction, credit recovery) is well thought out and includes a breakdown of how funds will be used over the life of the project. Moreover, the budget is designed to identify funds that will be used to sustain the project and includes leveraging of existing local, state, and federal funds. Over 52% of the project funds are coming from outside sources.

Overall this section is rated very high.

	Available	Score
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	10

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant provides a detailed high-quality plan for sustainability that includes investing in early childhood education and providing wrap-around services to at-risk parents and families to ensure that the trickle down process does not occur with other children in the family. The applicant cites data indicating that investing in proactive and preventative early childhood education programs have been proven to have a much higher-cost-benefit ratio than intervention and remediation services. This along with the extensive list of project partners who are providing human and capital resources make the likelihood of sustainability quite high.

Additionally, the applicant will invest a great deal in professional development to ensure a train-the-trainer model and in technology that will allow for strategies employed during the initial phases of the project to continue past the five years of grant funding. Moreover, the applicant provides a detailed budget that outlines the FTE's (38 FTE) that would be sustained through partnership funding. All elements of a high-quality plan are addressed as evidenced by the goals, objectives, deliverables, and key personnel that are highlighted as part of the overall project design.

Overall this section is rated very high.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	8

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant has provided a detailed list of partners and aligned them with each of the project components demonstrating a strong and sustainable program. Each of the partners are highlighted and aligned with the project component and services. There are a number of institutions that are providing financial support as well as facilities and instructors for areas (i.e. STEM) that are key to ensuring that students are career and college ready. The overall design is aligned with the four Race to the Top District educational assurances and include educational results that are tied to the common core standards. The measures for tracking achievement are clearly identified in the evaluation and include resources targeted specifically for students with special needs and who are identified as economically disadvantaged.

The applicant addresses a significant amount of the required elements of a high-quality plan (i.e., goals, objectives, timelines, key personnel) that are aligned with an overall strong project plan. The applicant will implement the proposed project in all the schools in the district, therefore scale-up will automatically happen. Additionally, the plan for integrating other services to students, parents, and families at each school include financial literacy, college mentoring, and early learning support.

Weaknesses:

The applicant fails to adequately describe how they will engage parents and families of students in the decision-making process as it relates to improving results. Moreover, it is not clear of how they will create a decision-making process and/or infrastructure to evaluate supports that address the individual needs of student participants.

Overall this section scores in the low range of high.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	**Met/Not Met**	**Met**

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does a good job of addressing the absolute priority. Throughout the narrative the applicant has identified strategies for building on the core educational assurances by creating learning environments that will significantly improve how students are educated in the district. The detailed charts outlining the gaps in achievement will be addressed through multiple strategic initiatives that include preparing students for college through blended learning courses. As stated in the vision section, the strategies to ensure goal attainment included the implementation of a holistic and seamless education system from birth through postsecondary education, which is clearly aligned with three of the four core educational assurance areas in the Race-to-The Top District program. As a result, the applicant has designed a system that includes adoption of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and investing significant resources in professional development for teachers and administrators. One of the key resources in professional development is Rigorous Curriculum Design (RCD), a sequenced hands-on model of curriculum design and a framework that systematically connects CCSS based curriculum.

Total	**210**	**176**

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0477OR-4 for McMinnville School District #40

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	**10**	**10**

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

McMinnville School District (MSD) has designed a focused grant application that addresses the needs of students from birth to grades 13/14. MSD is a high achieving school district that created realistic goals aligned with the state's 40-40-20 goals. MSD's Winning Future Project has eleven explicit objectives that are ambitious and achievable. The small school district of 6,512 students consists of only nine schools. The district has a clear focus on student achievement and individual student growth. The vision of the application is aligned with the educational assurances for the Race to the Top – District (RTTT-D) Grant. Full points have been awarded.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	**10**	**10**

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

If awarded the RTTT-D grant, all nine schools are selected to participate. The decision to select all students is clear from its vision to focus on student growth for all students. Including all students is appropriate. Below you will find the list of schools:

- Columbus ES
- Grandhaven ES
- Memorial ES
- Newby ES
- Sue Buel ES
- Wascher ES
- Duniway MS
- Patton MS
- McMinnville HS

MSD has adequately provided a clear table that list student/teacher demographics as defined in the grant notice. Listed below are the student demographics:

Total number of estimated students – 6,541

Estimated low-income students – 4,001

Estimated high need students – 4,390

Participating educators – 448

A collaborative effort to include teachers, administrators and a representative from the education association on the Race to the Top Committee is evident and supported throughout the proposal. The applicant has addressed this selection criterion and has received full award points.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	8

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

According to the district, all students will be serviced if awarded the RTTT-D grant. The district has provided a detailed description and timeline for implementation of education reform. The timeline outlines specific goals, attainable deliverables, and also identifies key personnel to ensure the vision is implemented. MSD desires to impact and improve student achievement at birth and therefore scale-up expectations will be fulfilled prior to mandated school enrollment. MSD has listed partners to ensure that vision is credible. The district failed to include a model of change linkage to their plan to improve student achievement. Eight points have been assigned.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	10

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Overall goals for all students and subgroups have been included and are sound. Table goals listed to improve student outcomes on performance based assessments are appropriate. District plans to decrease achievement gaps in reading, math, writing, and science are feasible.

A high standard has been set to ensure that all students have an effective teacher and principal. MSD's 2010 graduation rate was reported at 72.6%. Upon the completion of the grant cycle the graduation rate is expected to reach beyond 86%. Based on the vision description outlined in the application, MSD's plans are possible to obtain. Efforts to create smaller learning communities and to extend career pathway programs are reasonable. Raising the bar to go beyond ten percentage points is realistic and ensures that the district is prepared to support students in endeavors to complete high school requirements.

College enrollment rates have been reported at 54% and attainable goals for the 2017 year of 75% are realistic. MSD has set a goal of 35% for post-secondary degree attainment. The goals set in this grant application are sound and the district will receive full grant points for section A(4).

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score

(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	13

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

MSD has provided ample evidence of its clear track record of success from 2007-2011 school years. MSD has reported that 3 of its nine schools are considered model Oregon state schools and only 3 schools are considered average. All nine schools in the district rank in the top 50% of the schools in the state. The district documents that it has qualified leaders like their superintendent and principals and assistant principals that have received state recognition. Tables listed are clear. Data reporting on statewide assessments note that the district consistently increases student achievement in all areas for math. In the area of reading students with disabilities showed a decline in improvement during the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years. Proficiency growth rates in reading compared to the state average show decline in student achievement in 7th grade for limited English proficient (LEP) and economically disadvantaged students; drop in 6th grade for students with disabilities; drops in 6th and 7th grades for Hispanic students and a drop in 11th LEP scores. Proficient growth rates in math compared to the state average report a decline in economically disadvantaged, student with disabilities and Hispanic students for grade 11 and a drop in LEP performance in grade 7.

MSD does not have low achieving schools as defined by RTTT-D notice but describes efforts to increase student achievement. The applicant did not address specifically in detail how students and parents have access to achievement data via the online data base. A change in graduation rate calculations is mentioned but details are not specific on the decline in graduation numbers. The grant applicant will receive 13 for selection (B1).

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	4

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district has received multiple recognitions for high standards in government and financial reporting. MSD participates in the Open Books Project which reports school level funds, salaries and expenditures to the public. It is noted that the stakeholders in the district provide the public with detailed budget presentations. MSD provides information in public presentations to the general public. They also provide the information to local PTAs, businesses and to staff within the district. Specific details on how the Superintendent provides transparency to the public who are unable to attend public meetings and do not have access to 21st century technology has not been included. One point has been deducted. Four points have been assigned.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The state has given the school district flexibility with implementing credit for proficiency efforts. The ESEA waiver submitted by the state of Oregon allows the school district to select personnel that can assist with meeting the needs of students. The district has a clear focus for credit for proficiency and not mandated seat time. MSD has served as a pilot district for performance-based compensation evaluations. Performance-based systems in place are modeled throughout the state of Oregon. The district has described that there is a state mandate requiring schools to have performance-based evaluations no later than 2013-2014.

Full points have been awarded.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	8

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant notes that the school district is a small community that knows everyone. Appropriate evidence is listed of stakeholder support for the proposal. The appendix of this proposal includes letters from the Hispanic Parent Committee, school board association, institutions of higher education, and local parent-teacher associations. The district created an Investing in Effective Educators Design Team with 25 members to create the proposal. A detailed and extensive list of 30 committees that were critical to the development of the district project has been provided in the grant proposal. Evidence of how committees were involved with the development of the project is unclear. Selection B(4) will receive eight points.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Evidence of fiscal management, shared vision amongst stakeholders, and a need for improved student achievement in math, reading, science, and writing have been provided in the grant proposal and are included in the timeline included in the appendix.

The vision to raise achievement for all including non-school aged children is ambitious.

A plan to address gaps were not fully described but highlighted in a previously used plan.

The four questions used in the strategic planning process do not thoroughly link to timeline and activities and explain how the district will move forward to implement the vision. The questions listed do not fully address the criterion in a high quality plan.

A rating of 3 points has been assigned.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	20

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The extensive plan to improve learning and teaching in MSD is ambitious. The high-quality plan includes the following:

- Child development workshops for early learners and their parents
- Balanced math programs that go beyond traditional classroom learning practice
- GED and Spanish classes for adult learners
- Common formative and interim assessments
- STEM-intensive teaching
- Multicultural curriculum and inquiry-based learning
- Flipped Learning for at home learners
- Extended learning opportunities
- Supplemental reading instruction
- Double blocked math classes
- Smaller Learning Communities(SLC)
- ASPIRE mentoring program for 6th -12th graders
- College Seminar Classes

The district's unique plan for the career pathways program will keep students engaged and provide opportunities for students to participate in unique field based experiences.

Included in this proposal is a sound multicultural curriculum that will prepare students to be work-force ready through inquiry-based learning opportunities.

Collaborative learning opportunities are described throughout the proposal. The SLC structure will allow students to be with a team of teachers and will create opportunities for sustained relationships.

College seminar classes, dual credit course work, and credit by proficiency courses are all well written project goals to ensure that high school graduation is feasible for students.

The detailed timeline included in the appendix documents data driven decisions goals for the district. Data monitoring for students achievement, discipline referrals and attendance will be reviewed every four weeks and in some cases monthly. Qualified personnel have been appropriately identified to monitor these tasks.

The district has an ambitious goal to increase the number of students that attend college. Training and workshops will be provided for students to assist them in creating personalized learning goals and complete personal education plans and profiles. Also, in MSD's efforts to assist high needs students, a transition program will be created for high needs students who have met graduation requirements to attend a half day program to receive college credit coursework that can later be transferred to a university.

The MSD high-quality plan is extensive, and all goals are reachable if the district is awarded RTTT-D funding. A description of deliverables and responsibilities of key personnel in charge of implementing the vision is sound. Full points have been awarded.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	17

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

MSD is focused on teacher development and has committed to providing each teach with 26 hours of instructional coaching within a school year.

District official efforts to support lifelong learning are commendable. Teachers and staff members are encouraged to seek knowledge outside the district. MSD has specified that it will compensate and provide incentives to staff members for enrolling in graduate and Advanced Placement courses.

Technology components are throughout the proposal. The district goal to implant technology rich learning opportunities in all classrooms on a daily basis is ambitious.

MSD's data team's goals will support efforts to address the needs of learners that are proficient, nearly proficient and in needs of assistance. The description of the data team responsibilities are focused on student achievement for all learners and can be successfully implemented with RTTT-D funding.

The performance based evaluation system measures used in the district are innovative. The plan includes the following evaluative components:

- Student Achievement
- Classroom growth on common formative and summative assessments
- Leadership duties
- Classroom observations

The timeline included in the appendix describes feasible goals, deliverables and parties responsible for implementation. September 2013 is the target date for implementation and training is set appropriately for January 2013.

Annual performance targets from the evaluation system and achievement compact rankings will ensure that highly effective teachers and principals are in all schools.

The district proposal demonstrates the commitment to student achievement, high quality instruction and professional development for stakeholders. Professional learning goals are included in the district proposal. MSD has provided a detailed description of Power Learning Strategies to activate the student learner and to close the achievement gaps but has not included a clear description of tiered professional development opportunities that are differentiated for novice and veteran teachers. Providing professional development at all levels of engagement is vital to ensure the needs of all have been met. An aligned professional goal tied to needs documented within the teacher evaluation is not clear. The Power Learning Strategies however do include components for training, inquiry based learning, and student personalized learning contracts and opportunities within the classroom for engaging students to work collaboratively.

A rating of 17 has been assigned.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	14

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

MSD is a small school district that has a leadership structure that can provide assistance to all campus in their efforts to raise student achievement. The leadership team includes the superintendent, administrative cabinet, an administrative council, levels council and building leadership.

Building leadership teams are described to have flexibility and autonomy over the budget, schedule and personnel decisions. Examples of how the high school has flexibility in establishing a block scheduled is described in the proposal. High and clear expectations for building leadership team members are evident in the description of leadership tenets.

MSD has thoroughly described its plan to provide opportunities for students to earn credits. The plan includes opportunities for students to learn inside the classroom, outside the classroom during non-traditional school hours, through documented prior learning, and appropriate examination.

This focused plan includes tiered standards for mastery. Students will have opportunities to participate in supplemental/customized instruction, extended day, self-paced learning and one-on-one tutoring.

The staff development plan Power Strategies for Effective Teaching, addresses the needs of all learners. If executed, the universal design for learning will provide flexible teaching approaches that can meet the needs of all students. Professional development opportunities will ensure the 21st century learner is equipped with the resources to be successful.

Varied learning formats for students with disabilities have been specifically addressed.

Support services that will be provided to schools are not mentioned in the proposal. The applicant addressed the criteria and will receive 14 points.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

MSD has committed to serving all students. The district foresees no cost to participating stakeholders.

District leadership teams will provide technical support to teachers. Family resource centers will be established at each school to provide online and phone support.

The district has written that data can easily be obtained and exported by parents using the eschool databases. Accessible data include classroom assessments, grades and student performance data.

The timeline provided in the appendix provides details of a plan to carry out the vision of the school district but fails to address the following:

- *A plan for support and provide access to students with online coursework and projects outside the school day*
- *A full description of the database formats accessibility to parents and students*
- *Assurance that schools within the LEA have interoperable data systems of reporting human resource data, student data, budget data, and instructional improvement*

An assignment of 5 has been awarded for D(2).

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	14

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Assigned tasks for the internal evaluator are appropriate and will ensure that RTTT-D funds and project goals are fulfilled with fidelity. Responsibilities of the internal evaluator include:

- Conduct extensive site observations
- Analyze student performance data
- Conduct extensive stakeholder surveys and interviews
- Formulate an interim and summative report with specific recommendations, based on critical analysis of performance data and site observations, to support continuous project improvement

The evaluator will assess the effectiveness and cost-benefit of project strategies and will also evaluate goals.

Feedback to stakeholders is supported in the proposal and is documented to be done on a continous cycle beyond the term of the grant. This proposal's feedback goals are reasonable. The district internal evaluator and project director designated responsibilities to share information with stakeholders during meetings and project staff meetings monthly is realistic. Information is also described to be share on the district and project websites.

The district has committed to hiring an internal evaluator but for objectivity has not considered the need of an external evaluator. The expectation for one person to carry out the outlined responsibilities is ambitious but reads to be overwhelming for one person to successfully implement. The applicant has been assigned fourteen points.

	Available	Score
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Provisions are satisfactorily described to share information with all stakeholders and include multiple formats of communication via social media, websites and newspapers. The district has also committed to making a video production about the project that will be updated and disseminated on the district website and youtube. Full points have been assigned.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	5

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Fifteen proposal measures are described in this proposal and each measure has a clearly stated purpose/rationale. Measures included are:

- Oregon Kindergarten Readiness Assessment
- Child Behavior Rating Scale
- 3rd grade statewide in reading and math
- 6th grade statewide assessments in reading and math
- 6th grade on-track 90% attendance rate
- 8th grade statewide assessments in reading, math and science
- 8th grade disciple referral rate
- 9th grade on-track (90% attendance and 6 credits)
- 9th grade discipline referral rate
- 10th grade on-track (1.5. career pathway credits)
- 11th grade statewide assessments in reading, math, science, and writing
- Graduation rate
- 12th grade earing 9+ dual high school/college credits
- Postsecondary enrollment rate
- Postsecondary degree completion rate

The inclusion of modifications and interventions to support students is evident. Interventions are noted to be made at both the project and student level. Target goals are reachable. MSD has described the team responsible for reviewing goals and targets. The district has been assigned 5 points.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Cost analysis will be monitored by the district. The district has partnered with business and industry partners to ensure sustained funding beyond the grant. Consideration of funding/investments for early childhood education, technology, and professional development have been comprehensibly explained. MSD's proposal timeline is appropriate and provides measures for effectiveness of RTTT-D funded activities. Full points are assigned.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The descriptions of allocations and expenditures are realistic and suitable. A description of funding for each year of the project is sound. 52% of the funding for MSD's project will come from leveraged local, state and federal funding. The total budget cost is estimated to be $41,281,765. Costs to sustain the proposal are clear. The district is requesting $19,978,819.00 in RTTT-D funding.

One-time investments represent 40% of the budget and has be thoroughly described. MSD's Pre-K program and online learning programs (virtual school, credit by proficiency, blended coursework, flipped learning) are examples of one-time investment that are operationalized after the first year of the grant cycle.

The applicant's budget narrative is comprehensive and detailed. 10 points have been assigned.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	10

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Letters of support from the state legislature, mayor, school board, chamber of commerce, local colleges, and early learning council have been included.

General, titled, and partnership allocations are listed in full detail for each year of the grant cycle. An explanation of one-time and short-term cost with the use of RTTT-D funding is realistic. MSD listed investments in early childhood and the inclusion of goals to provide wrap-around services for rat-risk parents and families is commendable. It is evident that efforts have been made within the district to close achievement gaps by raising stakes to invest money and time on students prior to their enrollment in school.

The explanation on how technology will be utilized beyond the grant cycle is sound. MSD vision of professional development for all stakeholders in the district is reasonable. 24% of the proposal's RTTT-D budget request will be dedicated to professional development. The MSD model to provide inclusive training for teachers and principals ensures that all stakeholders are uniformed in efforts to raise student achievement.

MSD has a thorough description of how teaching funding will be sustained beyond the grant cycle. The commitment and design of the college transition program is appropriate and with funding can realistically be sustained.

Full points have been assigned.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	8

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Documentation on the ASPIRE mentor program is included in the proposal. The CASA of Oregon program has a match college savings component. The district has partnership with Chemeketa Community College to service adult learners. The local community colleges also will assist students desiring dual credit for completing college level coursework. Staff from the Evergreen Aviation and Space Museum have committed to work with elementary schools so that students can gain field-based STEM instruction.

8 population leveled desired results are descriptive. Results desired include increase the health of students, community stability, social and emotional fitness, and educational preparedness.

High needs students will benefit from early learning workshops, ASPIRE mentoring program, college transition program and Family Resource Center. The description of the benefits to at risk students is fair and appropriate.

The entire district would benefit from the RTTT-D grant. Scale-up measures do not apply because the district has envisioned a project that will service all students in mind.

The desire to begin student achievement efforts before students enter grade K are ambitious. The district desires to also close achievement gaps and decrease the need of remediation are also justifiable.

This proposal has provisions to include partnerships to increase early learning, financial literacy and college mentoring. The description on integration within schools is reasonable.

Surveys, pre and post assessment of adult learners, student achievement on state exams, dual credit completion and post-secondary school enrollment will all be indicators on the success of partnership activities. College reimbursement for above professional development is one measure MSD builds capacity of staff.

The descriptions of the performance level measures used to measure student achievement are strong. Remediation efforts of struggling learners have been include in the proposal to ensure student achievement improves overtime.

Measures to adequately engage parents and families were not thoroughly described. The applicant describes efforts to provide workshops but does not provide specific information on how parents are included in planning and decision making.

Implementation of an accountability teams to monitor and assess all aspects of the project is ambitious and attainable. The

district has included achievable performance goals that focus on all learners. Set targets are realistic. 8 points have been assigned for the competitive preference priority.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

McMinnville School District (MSD) has designed a focused grant application that addresses the needs of students from birth to grades 13/14. MSD is a high achieving school district that created realistic goals aligned with the state's 40-40-20 goals. MSD does not have low achieving schools as defined by RTTT-D but describes efforts to increase student achievement. The district has an accessible online data base. MSD has a track record for success and has provided information on how to improve instruction. he extensive plan to improve learning and teaching in MSD is ambitious. The plan includes the following:

- *Child development workshops for early learners and their parents*
- *Balanced math programs that go beyond traditional classroom learning practice*
- *GED and Spanish classes for adult learners*
- *Common formative and interim assessments*
- *STEM-intensive teaching*
- *Multicultural curriculum and inquiry-based learning*
- *Flipped Learning for at home learners*
- *Extended learning opportunities*
- *Supplemental reading instruction*
- *Double blocked math classes*
- *Smaller Learning Communities(SLC)*
- *ASPIRE mentoring program for 6th -12th graders*
- *College Seminar Classes*

The district's plan for the career pathways program will keep students engaged and provide opportunities for students to participate in unique field based experiences. Also included in this proposal is a sound multicultural curriculum that will prepare students to be work-force ready through inquiry-based learning opportunities. Collaborative learning opportunities are describe throughout the proposal. The SLC structure will allow students to be with a team on teachers and will create opportunities for sustained relationships.

The detailed timeline included in the appendix documents data driven decisions goals for the district. Data monitoring for students achievement, discipline referrals and attendance will be reviewed every four weeks and in some cases monthly. Qualified personnel have been identified to monitor these tasks.

MSD is focused on teacher development and has committed to providing each teach with 26 hours of instructional coaching within a school year.

Professional learning goals are included in the district proposal. MSD has provided a detailed description of Power learning strategies to activate the student learner and to close the achievement gaps but has not included a description of tiered professional development opportunities that are differentiated for novice and veteran teachers. The power learning strategies however do include components for training, inquiry based learning, and student personalized learning contracts and opportunities within the classroom for engaging students to work collaboratively.

MSD has thoroughly described its plan to provide opportunities for students to earn credits. The plan includes opportunities for students to learn inside the classroom, outside the classroom during non-traditional school hours, through documented prior learning, and appropriate examination.

McMinnville School District has met the absolute criterion and within this proposal, has fully addressed how it would build on the assurance of the RTTT-D grant.

Total		210	189

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0477OR-5 for McMinnville School District #40

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant provides a coherent and comprehensive reform vision that builds on impressive district accomplishments in three of the four core educational assurance areas (adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace; building data systems that measure student growth and success; and recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals). Applicant specifies that none of the district's nine schools qualifies as low-performing or among the lowest-achieving schools, a fourth core educational assurance area.

	Available	Score
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant was clear and succinct in explaining the process and results of participant selection. In particular, applicant specifies that all schools (N=9) in the district will participate in the project, a decision made by the "Race to the Top" committee comprised of teachers, administrators, and the local teacher association president. School demographic data is provided for 6 elementary schools, 2 middle schools, and 1 high school, enrolling a total of 6,541 students. Of these total students, 67% are high-need, 61% are low-income, 31% are Hispanic, 13% are students with disabilities, and 71% are first generation (parents without a four-year college degree). The highest score is awarded for addressing fully and effectively all parts of the criteria for this section.

	Available	Score
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	9

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant presents a thoughtful and detailed implementation plan that includes goals, activities, timeline, deliverables, and key personnel for bringing about district-wide change and achieving outcome goals. The scale-up requirement is met by including all schools in the district. It would have been useful if the applicant provided an explicit a logic model or theory of change guiding school reform to achieve project goals. A high score is awarded for this criterion.

	Available	Score
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	10

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Ambitious yet achievable goals are demonstrated by the applicant for students overall and by subgroup (economically disadvantaged students; limited English proficient students; students with disabilities; Hispanic students; white, not Hispanic students) regarding (a) approaching the goal of 75% or greater students by race/ethnicity and economic disadvantage who demonstrate proficiency in Grades 3-11 as measured by state tests in reading, math, and science, (b) significant decreases in or elimination of the achievement gap for Grades 3-11 students in reading and math and for Grade 11 students in science and writing, approaching 0% difference for students by ethnic group and economic disadvantage, (c) significant improvements by students overall and by student subgroups in graduation rates (approaching goal of 90% or greater), college enrollment (approaching goal of 75% or greater), and postsecondary degree attainment (approaching goal of 35% or greater). In addition, applicant addresses student growth as well as achievement and sets the goal of all students (overall and by subgroup) having an "effective" or "highly effective" teacher and principal by the year following the grant period. The highest score is awarded for effectively addressing all parts of the requirements for this section.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	**15**	**13**

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant cites strong evidence of a track record of success that includes:

- Clear tabular data provided by the applicant shows that student proficiency has increased significantly overall and for student subgroups over the past 4 years, and steady progress has been made toward closing achievement gaps.
- Compared to state averages, reading proficiency is +5% to +12% greater than other school districts and math proficiency is +14% to +22% greater than other school districts for the several student subgroups--both of which are signifiant achievments considering the high percent of low-income and high-need students in the district.
- Commendably, 3/9 schools in district have been designated by the state as "model schools,"defined as high-poverty schools in the highest achievement level.
- MSD superintendent and principal selected for outstanding state and state/national awards respectively.

There are not any "persistently lowest-achieving schools" or "low-performing schools" in the district.

Applicant does not adequately explain changes in high school graduation rate as shown in the table other than the state formula was altered.

A high score is awarded in this section for effectively addressing all of the criteria.

	Available	Score
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	**5**	**4**

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

In support of the district's evidence for accountability, applicant identifies MSD as a nationally-recognized, multi-year recipient of financial report award from Government Finance Officers Association.

As evidence of district transparency, applicant cites the following exemplary district practices:

- Providing public access to its annual financial report on the district website.
- Participating in the "Open Books Project," which provides publicly and easily accessible data, graphs, and charts for comparable district expenditures (personnel, technology, and other).
- Hosting public meetings and presentations to discuss the district's budget.

Discussion of transparency practices does not explain how low-income and Hispanic populations are reached effectively.

	Available	Score
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	**10**	**10**

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant provides strong evidence that state laws and regulations create conditions and autonomy for implementing all project-related strategies and structures regarding personalized learning environments, that include but are not limited to:

- Legislation action that includes but is not limited to supporting (a) performance-based compensation and evaluation of teachers and principals (MSD one of 16 districts in pilot), (b) credit for proficiency, (c) supplemental or expanded day kindergarten, and (d) 40/40/20 college graduation goals [40% bachelor's or graduate degree, 40% associate degree or career-technical certification; 20% high school diploma/equivalent and workforce-ready skills to earn a living family wage].
- State ESEA waiver that creates space for holistic education reform, Common Core and Smarter Balanced assessments, state assessments that include meaningful measures of achievement <u>and</u> growth based on multiple indicators, and definitions of "highly qualified" teacher emphasizing student achievement <u>and</u> growth.

The highest score is awarded for fully meeting all requirements of this section.

	Available	Score
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	**10**	**9**

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant impressively identifies 30 different groups, representing a broad range of internal and external stakeholders, who contributed to project design and development. The list of project developers includes the president of the local teachers association, who also signed the application assurances form.

Letters of support that solidly endorse the project are provided by representatives of the LEA school board, state department of education, state school board association, higher education systems office, Hispanic Parent Committee, school-level parent teacher associations (PTAs), local and private organizations, Head start, and health agencies.

Representative student involvement in the design and development of the proposal was not explained.

A high score is awarded for this section for addressing all related criteria.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant cites the district's 2008 strategic planning process that involved an assessment of needs and gaps linked to current school reform efforts in the district as well as the RTTD application. Four broad goals guide the needs/gaps assessment:

1. How do we design and deliver personalized learning environments that increase all students' interpersonal, problem-solving, and conflict resolution skills, that create a safe and connected school culture and climate, that increase the rigor and relevance of learning, and that maximize student motivation, engagement, independence, and confidence?
2. How do we design and deliver standards-based instruction, curriculum, and assessment that successfully addresses the differentiated needs of all students while improving their rate of learning such that they progress through school and graduate from high school with the knowledge, skill-sets, and critical thinking capacities necessary for career and college success in the 21st century world?
3. How do we create functional formative, interim, and summative assessment and monitoring approaches that can be used to evaluate the impact of instruction and guide development of data-driven and strategic interventions and enrichments based on learner need?
4. How do we design and deliver this integrated, personalized educational system that utilizes data-based assessment and problem-solving to guide decision making and provide ongoing formative and summative evaluation, and how do we institutionalize the process such that it becomes self-generating, self-replicating, and responsive to current and future student needs?

A middle-range score is awarded for this section because the four guiding questions are not directly connected to the project's high-quality implementation plan. Also, it would have been useful to create a deeper understanding of the district's needs/gaps analysis by explaining the logic or theory behind the district's plan.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	19

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant convincingly identifies and describes 21 core components for engaging and empowering all learners in a high-quality plan, which fully addresses all components (goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, responsible particles) for implementing personalized learning environments, with features that particularly:

- span from early childhood to post-graduation,
- focus on academic achievements as well as college- and career pursuits,
- address the needs of all students, particularly those with high-need, and
- promote the development of skills and dispositions for self-regulated learning.

Action components of the high-quality plan for improving teaching and learning in include but are not limited to:

- Ready for Kindergarten, an age-targeted child development workshops for parents of children birth to age five, provided in English and Spanish, and universal (district-wide) half-day, preK program for four-year-olds, to ensure they are ready for kindergarten and are succeeding in school by or before third grade.
- Balanced approach to intensive literacy interventions in preK- 3rd grade and Balanced Math Program in K-5th grade, focused on understanding the processes and strategies that lead to effective problem solving.
- Comprehensive preK through grade 13/14 educational programs characterized by: (a) Standards-based curriculum, instruction, and assessment;

- (b) Common formative and interim assessments to target instruction and accelerate learning; (c) Technology-rich teaching and learning; (d) Personalized learning goals; (e) Multicultural curriculum and inquiry-based learning; and, (f) STEM-intensive teaching and learning.
  - Positive Behavior and Instructional Supports (PBIS), implemented in all district schools, to improve school culture and climate, increase student engagement, and foster social and emotional development in PreK-12th grade.
  - Credit by Proficiency (online and onsite) coursework, including credit recovery courses and Virtual School.
  - Career and Life Role Education curriculum with common curriculum goals, grade-level indicators, and aligned learning activities in 3rd, 5th, 8th, and 10th grade.
  - Career Pathway coursework featuring community-based internships, student-run enterprises, etc.
  - College Seminar Classes in 9th-12th grade focusing on career- and college-readiness, planning, and preparation, financial literacy, completing the critical steps to college-entry, college campus visits and parent engagement activities, and the development, revision, and monitoring of Personal Education Plans (PEP) and Profiles, a graduation requirement.
  - Wrap-around family educational services, technology access and assistance, and other resources for parents and families of at risk students.

A high score is awarded for this section because it effectively addresses all of related criteria.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	19

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

To help educators improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress in personalized learning environments, the applicant clearly describes strong practices for implemening project strategies and structures for all participating educators, including school leaders and school leadership teams. These strong practices include:

- Performance-based compensation based on multiple measures, including value-added student growth.
- Performance-based evaluation systems that are clear, fair, transparent, and aligned with state requirements and RTT-D expectations.
- Intensive and sustained professional development in three foundational areas of the applicant's project—Rigorous Course Design, Power Strategies for Effective Teaching, and Common Formative Assessments and Data Teams.
- Technology-rich teaching and learning.
- A research-based model of professional development delivery, featuring (a) embedded staff development in professional learning communities, (b) data teams, (c) intensive workshops, (d) job-embedded instructional coaching, and (e) advanced degrees and licensures.

Applicant makes explicit the highly commendable goal that 100% of the students in district schools will receive instruction from effective or highly effective teachers and principals by the year following the grant period.

Almost all of the points are awarded for the section because the criteria are effectively addressed with the minor exception that a differentiated professional development plan for each educator (teacher, principal) is not explained.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	14

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant provides a clear organizational chart of MSD leadership structure related to project support and services.

Regarding sufficient flexibility and autonomy of leadership teams, applicant cites exemplary practices where the building leadership team adopted an A/B block schedule, restructured the school into smaller learning communities and career pathways, collaborated to develop job descriptions for Team and Pathway Leaders, guided development of the Embedded Staff Development Calendar, and made decisions about building level budget and other resources.

As opposed to course credit based on "seat time," applicant emphasizes more preferably "Credit by Proficiency," which provides students the opportunity to show progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery a core component of the project.

Another exemplary practice emphasized by the applicant involves carefully designed student performance-based assessments, both formative and summative, which will be administered throughout the year in multiple formats.

In addition to Universal Design for Learning standards, applicant effectively explains how instruction is differentiated for and adapted to learners with different needs.

A high score is awarded for this section because all of the criteria are effectively addressed with the exception that more specific information about district support or services would promote a deeper understanding of LEA policies and practices.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

In support of personalized learning, applicant clearly identifies the following features of district and school infrastructures:

- The project will be implemented in all schools and for all learners and grade levels, including birth to age 5, with components specifically tailored for economically disadvantaged and other high-need students, parents, and families.
- Technical support will be provided for students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders for all project components, including online coursework, database access, and intervention programs.
- Parents and students can easily export their information from the district's online database, eschool.

Eschool is directly linked to and interfaces with Cognos, an easily accessible database encompassing human resources, student information, budgets, instructional improvement, and student achievement and performance.

A high score is awarded for this section because the criteria are effectively addressed; however, additional details about how stakeholders would have access (in and out of school contexts) to project resources would have been useful to promote a deeper understanding of LEA and school infrastructure.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant clearly specifies that the district will provide an internal evaluator who will perform formative, interim, and summative evaluations of the project, drawing on both qualitative and quantitative measures that also are specified, in order to:

1. Assess the effectiveness and cost-benefit of project strategies to determine whether they produce meaningful effects on student achievement and whether and to what extent the project achieves its intended outcomes.
2. Evaluate the implementation of individual components within the project for purposes of ongoing feedback and continuous improvement.
3. Support all reporting and accountability requirements set forth by the RTTD program, including reporting on project goals, performance indicators/measures, and targets.
4. Provide guidance about effective products and practices for dissemination, replication, and/or testing in other settings.
5. Conduct a systematic, multi-factor, cost-benefit assessment that incorporates optimal progress performance indicators, as such variables are vital to achieving project outcomes and in assessing the cost-benefit of individual services and activities.

More specifically, applicant clearly describes:

- Monitoring activities that include extensive site observations (regarding instructional support, social/emotional support, career and college readiness support, and student, parent, and family support), analysis of student performance data, and stakeholder surveys and interviews.
- An observation measure to assess teacher and/or mentor behaviors and student behaviors.
- Sharing project information, including performance data and results, with the project advisory council comprised of stakeholder representatives, project staff and Building Leadership Team meetings, district website, and project website.

The highest score is awarded this section because all of the criteria are fully and effectively addressed.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant comprehensively identifies strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholder, including:

- district, school, and project websites;
- district posts on social media such as Facebook and Twitter;

- articles and reports in local newspaper and media;
- Building Leadership Team meetings and staff meetings;
- state-level education publications and those through postsecondary and business/industry partners;
- regional and state education organization meetings;
- presentations at state, regional and national conferences;
- Annual Performance Report and internal education report; and
- superintendent's annual town hall meeting which includes presentations by project stakeholders.

In addition, SOAR Productions, an MHS student-run enterprise, in partnership with a local museum, will make a comprehensive video production about the project and will update the video periodically for dissemination through the district website and YouTube.

The highest score is awarded for the section because all of the criteria are fully and effectively addressed.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	5

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant succinctly identifies 15 performance measures, accompanied by a strong purpose/rationale and detailed charts, representing ambitious and achievable goals and indicators in order to:

(a) provide rigorous, timely, and formative data,

(b) evaluate the project's success toward achieving its outcomes,

(c) make modifications to the project as warranted by performance data, and

(d) develop effective interventions to address areas of concern, both on a project level and student level.

The 15 performance measures are:

1. Oregon Kindergarten Readiness Assessment
2. Child Behavior Rating Scale
3. 3rd grade statewide assessments in reading and math
4. 6th grade statewide assessments in reading and math
5. 6th grade on-track (90% attendance rate)
6. 8th grade statewide assessments in reading, math, and science
7. 8th grade discipline referral rate
8. 9th grade on-track (90% attendance and 6 credits)
9. 9th grade discipline referral rate
10. 10th grade on-track (1.5 career pathway credits)
11. 11th grade statewide assessments in reading, math, science, and writing
12. Graduation rate
13. College credits earned by high school students
14. Postsecondary enrollment rate
15. Postsecondary degree completion rate

For each of these measures, applicant clearly specifies performance goals overall and by student subgroup. The applicant is to be applauded in setting ambitious performance goals that would close the gap between student subgroups and approximate the same high-level intended outcomes for disadvantaged students, Hispanic students, and white students.

The highest score is awarded for this section because all of the criteria are fully and effectively addressed.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	4

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

A high score is awarded for this section because the criteria are effectively addressed as demonstrated by the applicant's plan to:

- Systematically evaluate the effectiveness of investments as detailed in the Continuous Improvement Process section and the proposed evaluation plan.

- Draw a useful distinction among different facets of investment evaluations in education, including cost analysis, cost-effectiveness analysis, and cost-benefit analysis.
- Focus on cost-benefit analysis, with examples that include but are not limited to early childhood education, technology, and professional development.

This section could be strengthened by addressing considerations for an external evaluator to complement the tasks of the proposal internal evaluator, particularly regarding the effectiveness of investments.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant comprehensively identifies all funds that will support the project, including RTTD funds, LEA general funds, Title I funds, and funds contributed by partners. Applicant clearly describes how one-time investments/short-term costs and ongoing operational costs will be used to support the development, implementation, and evaluation of project components related to project goals, including costs that will continue in sustaining project goals after the grant period.

The highest score is awarded this section because the applicant fully and effectively addresses all criteria.

	Available	Score
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	10

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The highest score is awarded for this section because the applicant fully and effectively addresses all related criteria for sustainability as evidenced by:

- Non-RTTD funding for the project represents approximately 52% of total project costs.
- The non-RTTD funding includes district general funds supporting approximately 38 FTE of project personnel who would be sustained after the grant period in addition to Title I funds.
- Partnership funds supporting five early childhood programs also would be continued post-grant.
- In explaining the sustainability of project goals, if the project achieves its objectives or makes significant progress toward achieving them, the applicant convincingly argues that it is reasonable to assume sustainability because (a) investments in early childhood will have a high benefit-cost ratio and community partners and other sponsors will want to continue their support, (b) technology investments will result in more efficient and effective instruction that will continue to provide benefits at the end of the grant period, and (c) professional development investments will increase site-based capacity to sustain professional learning for teachers and principals.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	8

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

A high score is awarded for this section because the applicant effectively addresses partnership criteria by describing specific population-level results, tracking and using performance indicators, integrating education and other services, building capacity, and setting ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the following project components and partnerships. Examples of partnering alliances include:

- Child development workshops for parents of children birth-age 5 and university preK (7 community partners)
- Extended learning before and after school (2 partners)
- STEM-intensive teaching and learning (3 partners)
- Career pathway learning (4 partners)
- College transition program (3 partners)
- Family resource centers (4 partners)

Not all of the available points for this section are awarded because the description of supporting partnerships that serve

parents and families tend to be focused more on "providing" than "engaging" participants.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Applicant provides sufficient evidence that Absolute Priority 1 is met, that is, how it will create learning environments which:

- are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators;
- are aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements;
- accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student;
- increase the effectiveness of educators;
- expand student access to the most effective educators; decrease achievement gaps across student groups; and
- increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

Total	210	195